

Appl. No. 10/699,440
Amdt. dated January 10, 2006
Reply to Office action of December 13, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

There are no amendments to the drawings.

Attachment: None

Appl. No. 10/699,440
Amdt. dated January 10, 2006
Reply to Office action of December 13, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the above-identified office action, the Examiner stated that there are two patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: (1) Transparent polymerizable layer including sol-gel or monomer (claims 1-34); and (2) Transparent polymerizable layer including polymer (claims 35-36).

The undersigned attorney is electing to prosecute claims 1-34 which are directed to the single disclosed species of "at least one transparent polymerizable layer including a sol-gel or monomer". Claims 1-34, as originally presented are readable on this single disclosed species.

Claims 35 and 36, which are directed to the second disclosed species of "at least one transparent polymerizable layer including polymer" are being canceled by this amendment.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-34 now meet the statutory language of 35 U.S.C. §121 in that Applicants are claiming a single distinct species which is the Transparent polymerizable layer including a sol-gel or monomer. Applicants respectfully request that prosecution on the merits of the above-identified application be directed to this species. Applicants election of the single distinct Transparent polymerizable layer

Appl. No. 10/699,440

Amdt. dated January 10, 2006

Reply to Office action of December 13, 2005

including a sol-gel or monomer species for prosecution on the merits is made without traverse.

Respectfully submitted,


David S. Kalmbaugh

Reg. No. 29,234

Tel.: (805) 989-8266